THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS'

MILLENNIAL STAR.

He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.—Jesus Christ.

Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.—A Voice from Heaven.

No. 2, Vol. XX. Saturday, January 9, 1858. Price One Penny.

LETTER TO THE "DAILY TELEGRAPH."

Editor *Daily Telegraph*.

Sir,—My attention having been arrested by an article which lately appeared in your paper, I consider it due to the public that the following facts should be laid before them, and trust that you consider it one of the highest objects of your mission at all times to correct the public mind. It is especially due to the people of Utah, at the present crisis, to say that by that article they are greatly misrepresented; but, by the insertion of this communication, it will appear that on your part it was not maliciously done.

That article says, "We have in Mormonism a system of government that refuses to amalgamate itself with the great Federal Union, or in any way to acknowledge or respect its authority." In answer to this, permit me to say that, since 1849, the citizens of Utah have unceasingly sought for an intimate alliance and amalgamation with the Federal Union. They then presented their petition to Congress for admission into the Union with a State Government, which was refused; but a Territorial Organization was granted to them, which was most readily accepted. In this capacity, the Legislature of that Territory has yearly enacted laws for the regulation of its citizens. Those laws, as required by the Organic Act, have been yearly submitted to the President and Congress of the United States for their approval or disappoval; and not one of them, up to the present date, has been declared void or unconstitutional by that authority; neither has their disappoval of any one of them been intimated.

In the spring of 1856, a Convention of Delegates, elected by the people, pursuant to legislative enactment, was held in Great Salt Lake City, and a State Constitution framed,—which, with a special delegation, was forwarded to Congress, with the application of more than 70,000 petitioners to be admitted into the "Federal Union." This application was refused, in consequence of religious prejudices, without any legal or constitutional objections being made. The late proclamation issued by Governor Young states most emphatically that they do not now and never have claimed more than the Constitution of their common country guarantees to them. This is all that has ever been asked, could be asked, or even desired by the people of Utah. I state this from a knowledge of the facts, having been a citizen of that Territory since 1849, and a greater portion of the time a member of the Legislature, and also of the Municipal body of Great Salt Lake City. Knowing, as I do, that there is not the least possible ground on which, in justice, your statement can be founded, I am led to conclude that it was made

without a knowledge of existing facts, and that you will have the greatest pleasure in correcting so unwarrantable an assertion.

You say, "Overtures have been repeatedly made to induce Brigham Young and his immediate adherents to place themselves within the pale of the Constitution, and submit peaceably to the general laws of the Confederation." Now, my dear sir, you and every other man of common information ought to know that they are not, and never have been *out* of "the pale of the Constitution." You ought to know that both "Brigham Young and his immediate adherents" are natural-born American citizens, and would have been living to this day in one or more of the Federal States of the Union, if they had not been most unjustly driven from their homes by an armed mob, to find that protection among the savages of the wilderness which was denied them where civilization and Christianity reigned. They are now where the American Government has suffered them to be driven, and looked, untouched in their feelings, upon the privations and sufferings necessarily endured while traversing the barren deserts and making a home in the parched and desolate wilderness, a thousand miles from the white man's "home of the free." If, as you say, it is "a subject of humiliating reflection to the citizens of the United States" that the "Mormons" occupy such an important position within their Territory, do let the world know that they occupy that position of necessity—that they were *driven* there by those who now deplore the consequences of their occupying that position; and let them know further that there has not been the least inducement offered to cause them so to do, but that they have, as it were, instinctively clung to the parent Government, like the infant child to its mother's breast. They have cried, from the first, for admission into the Union; they have pleaded their right to be favourably recognized by the parent Government, and have claimed its protection under "the general laws of the Confederation." But their cries, their entreaties, and their demands have been in vain. This is, indeed, the great cause of their complaint. And in the very face of these facts, which should be known by almost every schoolboy, from the publicity they have had, we are told that "overtures have been repeatedly made to induce them to submit peaceably to the general laws of the Confederation." Now, sir, I believe I am extending to you the very utmost lenity in admitting the possibility of your making such entirely unreasonable statements through ignorance.

Further, you say, "The people of the United States have at no time desired to meddle with the *faith* of any person or community: the most ample liberty of opinion, in matters spiritual and political, has been accorded to all persons." So far, you say, "is this grand axiom maintained, that every State is permitted to choose whatever character of Constitution its own subjects prefer;" and that "the Mormons might hold what opinions they choose—profess any creed which the peculiar idiosyncracy of their minds might induce them to cling to; they could organize their internal affairs after their own model; but it was thought a disgraceful inconsistency that a separate Government, having not the slightest connection or communication with the General Government, should be allowed to take root." Now, sir, you may believe me when I say, there is not probably a "Mormon" living that would differ from you in this last conclusion—that it would be a disgraceful inconsistency for any people to attempt to set up a separate Government under a Constitution which extended, and under an administration which secured to them all these rights and privileges which, you admit, belong to citizens of the American Government. And the fact that you are so well acquainted with the rights guaranteed to all citizens of the United States, and that they are all that any reasonable man could ask for, makes it the more strange that you could even allow yourself to believe that Brigham Young or the "Mormons" claimed more than the Constitution of the land granted to them, when you have every evidence, if you have any at all, to the contrary. The fact is, the people of Utah have been denied a State Constitution,—a right which you admit when you say that "every State is permitted to choose whatever character of Constitution its own subjects prefer." They have been denied the right of electing their own officers—a right which every State in the Union enjoys. They have been denied a State Government, for the very purpose that they should not have the power to

elect their own officers—a right which constitutes the great fundamental principle of American Constitutional Liberty. They have been denied the right to regulate their own domestic institutions. They have been denied, time and again, officers of their own choice, while in their Territorial capacity, when that choice has been officially made known to the General Government, the ability and character of which were unquestionable. They have been most emphatically denied the right to exercise their religious views or to cherish their domestic religious institutions; and those views and institutions have mainly constituted the objections urged against their admission into the Union. In being denied these rights, they have been virtually disfranchised and severed from the General Government, against which their strongest protestations have constantly been urged. They have sought, and urged, and most fervently desired to enjoy the common rights of American citizens; and this is all they claim. They insist upon having them, and will not be satisfied without them. If the people of Utah ever occupy a position independent of the American Government, it will be, as they now occupy their mountain home—when they are *driven* to it; and those who thus force them to extremes must alone be answerable for the consequences. A long-continued course of injustice and oppression may serve to make that a welcome day, should it ever come.

It is not necessary for Brigham Young to complain that "the Mormons have not been treated as American citizens, to succeed in inspiring them with an ill-regulated and abominable zeal." The people themselves know the *justice* of that complaint. They have all drank for themselves the dregs of the bitter cup, and none need that Brigham Young or any other should tell them that it is not sweet. It is the many, and not the few, who are too well acquainted with the history of the past—with the grievous wrongs that have been endured. And while you "wish it to be distinctly understood that the war—if war should ensue—about to be waged against Utah has no religious pretext," we wish it to be as distinctly understood that, if war takes place with the people of Utah, it is because they are denied both their political and religious rights under the American Constitution, and are driven to the extreme of self-defence, to save themselves and their religion from being destroyed from off the earth.

But, sir, lest I should protract my communication beyond the limits it could be allowed to occupy in your widely-circulated paper, I must simply be permitted to repeat, in a more simple form, that the people of Utah have never refused to amalgamate themselves with the great Federal Union; nor, in any one instance, have they refused to acknowledge or respect any authority or power legally exercised under the Constitution. They have never required any *inducement* on the part of the Federal Government, but have exercised a degree of fidelity and loyalty thereto of which few of their sister Territories can boast. And instead of any overtures being made, many advantages and grants freely bestowed upon adjoining Territories have been unjustly withheld from Utah. They have never even been "*desirous* of establishing, independently of national law or constitutional control, a separate kingdom;" much less have they been inclined to attempt it. And whether they are permitted peaceably to remain in Utah, or whether by force of arms they are again driven from their homes, the Constitution of the American Union they will ever respect and venerate with a sacredness which the blood and lives of their fathers which were sacrificed to obtain it demand. So far as the *present* position of the people of that Territory may appear the least inconsistent with these facts, it must not be misconstrued into a rebellion against the principles of the American Constitution and Government. It is for self-preservation alone, after being denied both constitutional and religious liberty.

I am, sir, yours respectfully,

S. W. RICHARDS.

42, Islington, Liverpool.

MEN will wrangle for religion, write for it, fight for it, die for it,—anything but live for it.

TRUTH often suffers more by the heat of its defenders than from the arguments of its opposers. Reason is often commended by the coolness of those who offer it.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN.

(*Continued from page* 3.)

To acknowledge in theory the great rights of man and the enactments of the Creator is just; but to deny them afterwards in practice is perjury and a mockery against both God and man.

In the foregoing, we have brought before the minds of our readers the cardinal rights of man as a thinking, religious, and responsible being. We have considered free agency as a fundamental and necessary condition to the very existence of *thinking* being. The soul is not a machine. That which is termed spiritual and thinking nature is not mere mechanical force. Thought cannot be measured out to the mind by rule and compass. Impulsive life will not travel in an arbitrary direction; and the immortal spirit, with its infinite and versatile powers, cannot be held by the chains of creeds or legislative enactments. Free agency in thought, then, is absolutely essential to thinking being.

We have also claimed free agency as the very basis of man's accountability. As a religious being, his agency is still indispensable. Freedom of conscience grows out of this primary right, and coercive faith is antagonist to both. We have seen that God, in His works and dealings, has acknowledged these fundamental laws, and, in His economy, has preserved them inviolate. Not only has He tolerated myriads of faiths, and an almost infinite variety of thought, but, in allowing a Devil to exist, He has, if we may so express it, admitted even the Satanic agency—admitted the liberty of the Devil to entertain his devilish views, his devilish thoughts, and his devilish disposition. It is true, the Almighty holds the hosts of hell accountable, but it is not for exercising these rights. It is because they infringe on the rights of others—because they interfere with His economy and wage war against His creatures and subjects. From these considerations, we lay down free agency, liberty of thought, freedom of conscience, and unrestrained faith, as essential to the existence of thinking, religious, and responsible being, and as necessary conditions to give consistency to the ideas attached thereto. As a Mormon, then, is a man, all these rights belong to him; and were he even a devil, God, by precedent, has granted to him these rights; and, therefore, taking an extreme view of the case, we are justified in claiming them.

Perhaps there can hardly be found an individual with ordinary intelligence and respect for the rights of man who would boldly protest against the rights of the Saints as men. Their claims to free agency, their right to the peculiar disposition of their minds, their privilege of embracing the faith which recommends itself to their judgment and feelings, their right to believe in the divine mission of Joseph Smith, or in any other feature of their religion, will not, we apprehend, be denied in theory. The most ordinary understanding would have enough sagacity to see that such a denial would cover more than was intended, and that, admitted against one man, it would fit every other. They could not well help realizing that, in finding its level, it would overshadow every individual, every community, every nation, and indeed all mankind. To utter a protest against the rights of the Saints, their free agency, and their faith, would in reality amount to a protest against the rights, agency, and faith of every man. It would sit as an incubus upon one thousand million beings. The Mormon could then in fairness bring the protest against every sect—the Catholic against the Protestant, &c. Indeed, on some point or other, a thousand million individuals, if the law were carried out, would be a thousand million intolerant protestators against one another. There would be universal strife. Every man's hand would be literally against his neighbour. Such principles as free agency, the rights of man, liberty of thought, and freedom of conscience would be inconsistent and meaningless. These rights of the Saints our liberal (?) opponents are, therefore, bound to admit, or deny them at the expense of the rights of every man. But it is only in word that our rights are admitted. The following questions will find a ready affirmative in the general

mind, and this affirmative has become a pet doctrine with the popular press in its dealing with the Mormon problem. The intellectual lords imagine that they thus give it a consistent solution.

Have not the United States the prerogative to declare that they will not have a Mormon community in their territory? Has not a State the right to say that it will not have them within its borders? Has not a man the privilege of saying that he will not have a Mormon neighbour, and that the faith of the Saints shall not take root near *his* homestead? Of course, in wording these questions, our enemies would couple them with opprobrious epithets, and season them with expressions of abhorence. And such expressions and epithets we know would be to weak and silly minds as hobgoblins, whose imagined existence is the terror of childhood. They would also excite the prejudice and raise the choler of fools and bigots, but could not hide the merits of the case from just and reflective men.

Not only have these questions found an affirmative in words, but they have also found it in deeds, in actions, in blows. That affirmative has been forced home at the point of the bayonet, exhibited on the edge of the sword, and sent hissing from the deadly revolver. These answers have been published in extermination, and illustrated by ravishment, robbery, and mobocracy. They have deprived tens of thousands of their rights, and disfranchised a whole community. They have been written with the tears of the widow and the fatherless, and sealed with the gore of martyrs. Those who have thus dealt with the Saints will admit their rights in theory, but the rest of the tale our history will best relate. And even now the United States would exterminate the Mormons from their mountain fastness, and, for ought they care, send them to enjoy their rights in that "undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveller returns."

We, however, do not thus understand the rights of man. Justice will not be satisfied with the wordy admission of her laws by those who break and deny them in act; and those who thus trifle with her deserve her frowns and will kindle her indignation. To interpret the privilege of His creatures according to the spirit of the above is mocking the Almighty. A mere theoretical admission of the rights of man and a violation of them in practice is hypocritical dealing towards both God and man. To exterminate the Saints as natural or adopted citizens, to disfranchise and exile them, to send them to enjoy their rights beyond the borders of American territory, is, to all intents and purposes, denying and repealing both their natural and national rights. The individual who admits the agency of his neighbour, grants him liberty of thought and freedom of conscience in words, and, with professions of love and tolerance for him, will set fire to his house, and leave him to be consumed in the flames, is at once a hypocrite, an incendiary, and a murderer. We know how much his professions are worth. In such a light we are bound to view the United States or any nation who thus act towards the Saints.

We emphatically deny the United States the prerogative to say that they will not have a Mormon community within their territory; or a State, to say that it will not have them within its borders; or of an individual to say that he will not have a Latter-day Saint for his neighbour. True, if they will all evacuate the country in favour of the Saints, and, in carrying out their absurd, unjust, and intolerant dispositions, will renounce *their own* rights, it will not exceed the limits of their privileges and prerogatives. But to demand the sacrifice at the hands of their Mormon fellow-citizens and neighbours is not just.

If the Latter-day Saints are entitled to the rights of man, as they undoubtedly are, their rights will hold good, irrespective of time, place, or circumstances. If it belongs to them to receive that faith which recommends itself to their minds, to exercise their agency, and claim liberty of thought and freedom of conscience, at any time, in any place, and under any circumstances, then those rights belong to them in *all* time, in *all* places, and under *every* circumstance. They would belong to them in the palace of the Queen of England, or in the city of Washington, as well as in the Rocky Mountains. They have belonged to them since 1830 to 1858. They will belong to them in 1958. Indeed, while time lasts, a "Mormon" exists, and the rights of man remain, they can with justice be claimed, and cannot in justice be withheld.

The great Creator, in giving an individual birth, not only declares, in that act

of creation, that the natural rights of the man are equal to those of other men, but therein is also contained an admission that his natural rights belong to him in the land of his nativity or in any part of the earth where it has pleased the Creator to place him; for the earth belongs to the Lord, and not unto man, nor any part of it to one more than unto another, unless the great Divine Landholder confers it by special gift. As far as the natural rights of man extend, all have equal claims upon the earth, and the privilege of an existence in any part of it where birth, the providences of God, or the course of events may place them. We must not, however, be understood as advocating absurd doctrines of promiscuous settlement, and no fixed right of property; nor must we be understood as denying to Governments and the members of society the prerogatives and privileges of organizing, making just divisions of the land, and legislating in the best manner to preserve public good and the general harmony of society. But we do mean to say that any act of legislation antagonistic to the natural rights of man is unjust.

A native American, then, has the undoubted right to be a Latter-day Saint in America, and to exercise in that land all the rights pertaining to thinking, religious, and responsible beings. To make a declaration contrary to this is blasphemy against the sacred rights of man. Who art thou that deniest to thy neighbour that which his Creator has granted to him? What nation is great enough to defy the Omnipotent and stand justified in repealing His enactments?

A nation is composed of a number of individuals of equal natural rights collected together in a national capacity. But this amalgamation does not subtract from individual rights. The fundamental object of such amalgamation is to better preserve the rights of every member of society, to prevent one man from trampling upon the privileges of his neigbour, and to restrain the human family from being as beasts of prey to one another. This is the great object of national organization. Therefore, to take from the Saints their rights, and disinherit them, is a breach of the first principle of national existence.

The leading paper of England considers that the present rebellion in India has been principally caused by the natives' not understanding the liberal spirit of Protestant Christianity. It holds that this country has manifested a too sensitive fear in avoiding the appearance of tampering with the religious rights of the natives, and that, in not giving a practical illustration of the liberal spirit of its Protestant policy, it has led them to misunderstand and be suspicious of the intentions of England—engendered a fear in their minds that this country secretly designed to supplant the Hindoo faith and coerce that people into abhorrent religions. The *Times* of November 28, 1857, has the following:—"During a whole century of dominion, we have failed to persuade the natives of India that we have not, and never can have, any intention of forcing them to abandon their religion for our own." If Protestant Christianity makes such an acknowledgement of the religious rights of a conquered race at the time of their rebellion, free-born or naturalized American citizens are surely entitled to the same privileges. We claim for the Latter-day Saints the same privileges; and to withhold them from that people is a violation of the spirit of Protestant Christianity, and a breach of its fundamental principles.

If we measure the rights of man as guaranteed by the glorious Constitution of America, then indeed are the Saints entitled to all they claim. Its spirit is to preserve man's agency. It grants him his rights as a thinking, religious, and accountable being. It declares that the faith of American citizens shall not be coerced, that liberty of thought belongs to them, and that freedom of conscience is their undoubted right. The whole tenour and design of that Constitution is to ensure man's natural rights and allow a community to regulate its own domestic institutions, and receive that faith which most recommends itself to their minds; and to grant the people the privilege of choosing their own officers is its fundamental principle.

(To be continued.)

PERSONS whose ears are ever open to catch reports should be avoided as the plague: they are mischief-makers and quarrel-mongers, and the very pests of society.—*James.*

HISTORY OF JOSEPH SMITH.

(*Continued from page 8.*)

[September, 1842.]

September: Wednesday, 7th. Early this morning I received a letter from Elders Adams and Rogers, of New York, who brought me several letters,—one from Dr. Willard Richards, who, referring to his visit with James Arlington Bennett, Esq., of Arlington House, says, "He would be pleased to receive a letter of President Joseph's own dictation, signed by his own hand;" which request I was disposed to comply with, but deferred it till the next day.

Governor Carlin writes as follows:—

Quincy, September 7, 1842.

Dear Madam,—Your letter of the 27th ultimo was delivered to me on Monday the 5th instant, and I have not had time to answer it until this evening; and I now appropriate a few moments to the difficult task of replying satisfactorily to its contents, every word of which evinces your devotedness to the interest of your husband, and pouring forth the effusions of a heart wholly his. I am thus admonished that I can say nothing, that does not subserve his interest, that can possibly be satisfactory to you; and before I proceed, I will here repeat my great regret that I have been officially called upon to act in reference to Mr. Smith in any manner whatever.

I doubt not your candour when you say you do not desire me "to swerve from my duty as executive in the least," and all you ask is to be allowed the privileges and advantages guaranteed to you by the Constitution and laws. You then refer me to the 2nd Section of the Charter of the City of Nauvoo, and claim for Mr. Smith the right to be heard by the Municipal Court of said city, under a writ of Habeas Corpus emanating from said Court, when he was held in custody under an executive warrant.

The Charter of the city of Nauvoo is not before me at this time; but I have examined both the Charters and city ordinances upon the subject, and must express my surprise at the extraordinary assumption of power by the Board of Aldermen as contained in said ordinance! From my recollection of the Charter, it authorizes the Municipal Court to issue writs of Habeas Corpus in all cases of imprisonment or custody arising from the authority of the ordinances of said city; but that the power was granted, or intended to be granted, to release persons held in custody under the authority of writs issued by the courts or the Executive of the State, is most absurd and ridiculous; and to attempt to exercise it is a gross usurpation of power, that cannot be tolerated.

I have always expected and desired that Mr. Smith should avail himself of the benefits of the laws of this State, and, of course, that he would be entitled to a writ of Habeas Corpus issued by the Circuit Court, and entitled to a hearing before said court; but to claim the right of a hearing before the Municipal Court of the city of Nauvoo is a burlesque upon the City Charter itself.

As to Mr. Smith's guilt or innocence of the crime charged upon him, it is not my province to investigate or determine; nor has any Court on earth jurisdiction of his case but the Courts of the State of Missouri; and, as stated in my former letter, both the Constitution and laws presume that each and every State in this Union are competent to do justice to all who may be charged with crime committed in said State.

Your information that twelve men from Jackson County, Missouri, were lying in wait for Mr. Smith between Nauvoo and Warsaw, for the purpose of taking him out of the hands of the officers who might have him in custody, and murdering him, is like many other marvellous stories that you hear in reference to him—not one word of it true; but I doubt not that your mind has been continually harrowed up with fears produced by that and other equally groundless stories. That that statement is true is next to impossible; and your own judgment, if you will but give it scope, will soon set you right in reference to it. If any of the citizens of Jackson county had designed to murder Mr. Smith, they would not have been so simple as to perpetrate the crime in Illinois, when he would necessarily be required to pass through to the interior of the State of Missouri, where the opportunity would have been so much better, and the prospect of escape much more certain. That is like the statement made by Mr. Smith's first messenger, after his arrest, to Messrs. Ralston and Warren, saying that I had stated that Mr. Smith should be surrendered to the authorities of Missouri, dead or alive; not one word of which was true. I have not the most distant thought that any person in Illinois or Missouri contemplated

personal injury to Mr. Smith by violence in any manner whatever.

I regret that I did not see General Law when last at Quincy. A previous engagement upon business that could not be dispensed with prevented, and occupied my attention that evening until dark. At half-past one. o'clock, p.m., I came home, and learned that the General had called to see me; but the hurry of business only allowed me about ten minutes' time to eat my dinner, and presuming, if he had business of any importance, that he would remain in the city until I returned.

It may be proper here, in order to afford you all the satisfaction in my power, to reply to a question propounded to my wife by General Law, in reference to Mr. Smith, —viz., whether any other or additional demand had been made upon me by the Governor of Missouri for the surrender of Mr. Smith. I answer, none. No change whatever has been made in the proceedings. Mr. Smith is held accountable only for for the charge as set forth in my warrant, under which he was arrested.

In conclusion, you presume upon my own knowledge of Mr. Smith's innocence, and ask why the prosecution is continued against him. Here I must again appeal to your own good judgment; and you will be compelled to answer that it is impossible I could know him to be innocent; and, as before stated, it is not my province to investigate as to his guilt or innocence. But, could I know him innocent, and were he my own son, I would nevertheless (and the more readily) surrender him to the legally-constituted authority to pronounce him innocent.

With sentiments of high regard and esteem, your obedient servant,

THOS. CARLIN.

To Mrs. Emma Smith.

Brothers Adams and Rogers called again this afternoon, and I related to them many interpositions of Divine Providence in my favour, &c.

(To be continued.)

THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS' MILLENNIAL STAR.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 9, 1858.

ORDINATION—APPOINTMENT.—No man has a right to administer the ordinances of the Gospel without being ordained for that purpose. Neither can a man be appointed to preside over those who have a right thus to administer, without holding like authority himself. Ordination and appointment, in the common use of the terms, are separate and distinct. The one gives man the authority to act, and the other places him in a position where he can exercise that authority. Many are ordained to the Holy Priesthood, and perhaps for years have the right to officiate in the Gospel ordinances, before they are required or have any particular occasion to exercise that right. An appointment, therefore, to an active position in the Kingdom of God does not necessarily imply an increase of authority in the Priesthood of God. Ordination confers upon man certain rights, which are eternal in their nature, and will ever abide with him so long as he does not forfeit them by his own conduct; but an appointment is of a very different character, implying a temporary use or exercise of those eternal powers and prerogatives. Like fleeting things of earth, subject to circumstances, it may exist a week, a month, a year, or even more, and then come to an end. But who appreciates or justly estimates this fact?

We write thus because many have not yet learned the difference between position and power. Some have even attached more importance to their position as presiding officers than to their actual authority in the Priesthood. An appointment has been to some a stumbling-stone over which they have fallen, and never been able to rise. Many have lately been appointed to important positions throughout the European Missions, and we trust that such may never be the case with any of them. The few observations which we make upon this subject are particularly for that class

of Elders whose welfare we most earnestly desire, as Presidents and Pastors appointed to watch over the flock of Christ.

Some have felt that they were much superior to others of their brethren because they were called upon to preside over a Branch or a Conference; and they have suffered a spirit of pride to enter into their hearts—a spirit to be jealous of their authority, and have thereby rendered themselves obnoxious to the people over whom they were presiding. Such a spirit leads to haughtiness, arrogance, and oppression, manifesting itself in partialities in administration—traits of character that are not only inconsistent with the calling of a servant of God, but which are abhorred by every faithful Saint who enjoys the Spirit of God. When a President has these feelings in his heart, the feelings of all good persons become alienated from him; he loses his influence over them, and consequently his power to do them good. The few that do obey him and receive his counsel do so from a mere sense of duty, that order in government may be preserved, and themselves saved from the evils of rebellion. A President can thus make his position a curse to himself, and become an offence and curse to the people—the very opposite to the intent and spirit of his calling. On the other hand, when a person is exalted, then is the time, above all others, that he should be humble. Humility is the *only* road to exaltation. It is written, "He that exalteth himself *shall be abased.*" Let no one, therefore, claim honour from his position, but know that honour lies in the diligent and faithful discharge of the duties belonging to that position, and that the reward obtained will be for actual services rendered.

Men betray their feelings in different ways; and the higher their position the more readily are their faults detected. Some have felt, when once called upon to preside over a Branch or Conference, that they could never occupy a lower position without its being a disgrace to them, or at least a very great condescension on their part. This view of the subject, however, is utterly inconsistent with the truth; and, when properly understood, a man who is really worthy of an appointment will be just as ready to deliver it up to his superior as to receive it from him, just as willing to preside over a Branch as over a Conference, just as willing to perform the duties of a Teacher as an Elder, and just as ready in his spirit to occupy one position as another, when circumstances require. The duties of the least office come within the province of his authority, and he should feel as free in his spirit to perform them as those of the highest. When he feels this way he feels right; he is passive and obedient, and can say truly, "Not my will, but thine be done." When Elders feel that, because they have been Presidents of Conferences, they cannot officiate as Presidents of Branches, or as Travelling Elders, we naturally expect to hear next that they cannot exercise faith, because it is the *first* principle of the Gospel, and that they are so far above it, that it would be a mortifying condescension to get so low, although we are told that, when that which is perfect is come, faith will still abide. Until man, like Jesus, becomes the Saviour of a world, he must not be above condescending as he did to the very lowest estate, and learn that true greatness is displayed in real condescension.

Those Elders now entering upon their new fields of labour for the year will be exceedingly blessed of the Lord, if they will but keep His Spirit with them. The present is an important period in the history of the latter-day work; and the character and importance of that work will rapidly become more prominent before the nations of the earth. Men who would be efficient in the service of God and in the defence of Zion need to be filled with the inspiration of God and the revelations of eternity. The workings of the Almighty will be of that wondrous magnitude that none others can comprehend His goings forth among the nations. The day of His mighty

power is at hand, and but few will be able to abide it. We rejoice to know that there are many faithful and efficient labourers in the Lord's vineyard. Those who have been appointed to preside are not the only ones worthy of similar opportunities. All faithful Elders shall reap their full reward, if they faint not.

THE PUBLIC PRESS.—The liberty of the press is the boast of civilized nations, but its dishonesty, injustice, rottenness, and corruption are beyond all conception. The dishonesty and fraud practised in the world are denounced with much bitterness as great national evils; but they are not to be compared with the evil and corrupting tendency of the press. The one may effect men's temporal concerns for a time, but the other most effectually demoralizes and vitiates the public mind. Instead of its being used as a means to enlighten the people and defend the truth, it has to a very great extent become a slave to popular feeling; and it is difficult to tell whether it most controls the public mind or is controlled by it. To say the least, the latter is the case to an alarming extent. Money and popularity can wield it at pleasure, and, as the wind does the weathercock, turn it whichever way they will.

An editor that will publish lies for the sake of chiming in with popular opinion, and then shun the truth when it is presented before him, is certainly one of the most dangerous and despicable characters of society. Such men should not only be denounced for their infernal cowardice and dishonesty, but they should be utterly abhorred for their readiness to sacrifice the happiness and lives of a nation, people, or community, upon the altar of their lustful and damnable cupidity. They know that to publish the truth about the "Mormons" would render them unpopular and be objectionable to their patrons, and patronage must be maintained at the sacrifice of truth and honour. Not only so, but a wilful and malicious system of falsehood and misrepresentation is adopted, which, if practised under oath in common Courts of Equity, would doom the perjured wretches to lasting infamy and disgrace. At the bar of Eternal Justice they will meet a merited retribution.

We insert in this number two communications written to leading journals, but not suffered to appear in their columns, though they were written expressly to correct misrepresentations and falsehood which had been published by them. These, however, are not isolated cases. It is the universal practice with Editors to refuse a "Mormon's" statement admission into their columns. There are very few exceptions. The many fruitless efforts that are made to get, through the press, the truth before the people, relative to the Saints, prove conclusively the determination that exists to put them down by keeping the truth hid as long as possible. It is in vain to look for honour from such a source of corruption. Grapes do not grow on thorns, nor figs on thistles.

PENNY FUND.—Although we do not, as has already been stated in former numbers of the *Star*, hold this Office or any of the funds of the same responsible for any deficiences which may occur in the "Penny Fund," or delinquencies of any of the Treasurers of that fund, we feel it our duty to guard all the interests of the Saints, both temporal and secular, as well as spiritual, to the best of our ability; and, in view of the many changes which are taking place throughout the Mission, among the Treasurers of that fund, we feel constrained to offer a few words of counsel on the subject.

Order and uniformity in conducting the business are very desirable, and will greatly facilitate the same. In order to bring about this desirable end, we wish all those Treasurers, whether of Conferences or Branches, who have opened "Penny

Fund" accounts with this Office in their own names, to immediately cause all such funds to be transferred from their individual names, to the name of the proper Conference or Branch; and that all remittances be hereafter made in the name of the Conference or Branch. Persons who at any one time deposit twenty shillings or upwards can have the amount placed to their individual names in this Office, and obtain a receipt, therefor without its appearing in the Penny Fund account.

Each Treasurer should exhibit his books publicly at some meeting of the Saints, that it may be ascertained if the correct amount has been credited to each individual; and that all errors, if any exist, may be corrected before the books are transferred. Each Treasurer is required, on delivering up the books to his successor, to produce and deliver to his successor receipts from this Office, and also money sufficient to balance the total amount received by him. He can then receive from his successor a receipt for the entire amount of cash and receipts thus transferred.

A strict and punctual compliance with these suggestions will secure harmony of action and the confidence and good feelings of all concerned.

UTAH MAIL.—The Utah Mail has arrived, bringing letters and papers with dates to October 7, too late for the news to appear in this Number. It will appear in our next.

APPOINTMENTS.—The following alterations and appointments are made in connection with the Welsh Conferences:—

That the Brecknockshire Conference be disorganized, and its Branches added to the Monmouthshire Conference.

That the Dyffryn, Conway, and Anglesea Conference be in future called the Carnarvonshire Conference.

That the Merionethshire Conference be disorganized, and the Machynlleth and Dinas Mowddwy Branches added to the Cardiganshire Conference; and Harlech and Festiniog Branches added to the Carnarvonshire Conference.

That the Carmarthen Conference be disorganized, and the Carmarthen and St. Clears Branches added to the Llanelly Conference; and Brechfa, Pencader, and Llansawil Branches added to the Cardiganshire Conference.

Elder Thomas Jones is appointed to preside over the North Wales Pastorate.

Elder John Davies is appointed to preside over the Eastern Glamorganshire Conference; Elder Edward D. Miles, over the Cardiff; Elder William Ajax, over the Monmouthshire; Elder Thomas Rees, over the Western Glamorgan; Elder Edward Pergwyn, over the Pembrokeshire; Elder John Treharne, over the Cardiganshire; Elder Thomas Jones, over the Carnarvonshire; and Elder Edwin Price, over the Flintshire Conference.

Elder Joseph Griffiths is released, on account of indisposition.

LETTER TO THE "ANDOVER ADVERTISER."

The following is an extract from a letter sent to the Editor of the *Andover Advertiser*, in reply to a scurrilous article published in that paper:—

Editor of the *Andover Advertiser*.

Sir—I presume your charge of licentiousness is intended to apply to polygamy. Remember that the men whose characters are most highly reverenced—whose writings are most deeply studied and venerated—whose thrilling psalms are most fervently sung, were polygamists! Were these polygamist Patriarchs, Prophets, and Psalmists guilty of "licentiousness?" Do moral right and wrong change their natures by lapse of time? If polygamy is "licentiousness" *now*, it was "licentious-

ness" *then*. Why did not God denounce it? Why did God say to David (2nd Samuel xii.), "I gave thee thy master's wives?" Was God guilty of licentiousness?

Seduction, prostitution, and licentiousness exist and fearfully increase in all your large towns; but such crimes are unknown in Salt Lake Valley. The penalty for such crimes in Christian England is occasionally 2s. 6d. per week!—not to compensate the months of mental and physical woe of the hapless mother; no,—that goes for nought; but to support the unfortunate infant. How fearful is the number of illegitimate births in England! In the Salt Lake Valley, every infant born has a father to welcome and give his name to it. You call Salt Lake Valley a "sink of iniquity;" but how infinitely more applicable are your words to London, with its 80,000 unfortunates, unpitied, forlorn, and hopeless. What tribunal affords them redress, or visits vengeance upon the vile perpetrators of their fearful wrongs?

You are anxious for the overthrow of what you call "Mormonism." It is based upon certain principles and facts. Its principles are—God loved the world and gave His Son as an atonement to be received, and as a Teacher to be obeyed; also faith, repentance, baptism for remission of sins (Acts ii. 38. John iii. 5. Acts xxii. 16); and the gift of the Holy Spirit by laying on of Elders' hands (Acts viii. 16. Acts ix. 17. Heb. vi. 1. 1 Timothy iv. 14). I respectfully challenge your dialecties to overthrow these principles. Designating our women "poor common drudges," and our men "ignorant-looking," is, you must admit, wretched logic. "Judge not according to the appearance," said he who was scorned by learned scribes, because he "had not learned letters"—he in whom men saw no beauty that they should admire him. You pronounce Joseph Smith a "wicked impostor." In his lifetime, Joseph Smith was frequently charged with crime, and brought before American Courts of Justice; but was he ever convicted? No; "cute" Yankee judges and juries, in all cases, acquitted him. Is it not monstrous injustice to denounce a man as a criminal whom juries always pronounced innocent? He was, however, basely murdered, at last, in defiance of all law and justice.

In proof of your charge of imposture, you instance the Book of Mormon. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses," says the Bible, "shall every word be established." Plates of stone, written by the finger of God, were delivered to Moses. None were permitted to handle those plates. The gold plates delivered to Joseph Smith were seen and handled by many. In preface to the Book of Mormon, we have the solemn declaration of three persons, whose names are signed, who state that they handled the plates, and heard the voice of God pronouncing the translation to be essentially correct. To the plates of Moses we have no such testimony. Those three men were afterwards cut off from the Church of Latter-day Saints, by Joseph Smith, for transgression. Was he not afraid they would divulge the secret lie? No; for out of the Church they bore the same testimony as when in it.

You affirm that the Book of Mormon "is based upon the romance of Spaulding." You forget that the Book of Mormon refers only to one tribe of Israel—that of Joseph, while Spaulding's novel speaks of the ten tribes. The one is a translation by an uneducated man; the other, the work of an educated Presbyterian Minister. The Bible is a revealed history of ancient people, some of whom flourished in Asia, Africa, and Europe, and the Gospel of Jesus as preached to them. The Book of Mormon is the revealed history of an ancient people who flourished in America, and the Gospel of Jesus as preached to them. In dealing with the character of Jesus Christ, you judge by the testimonies of his apostles and friends; but, in dealing with the character of Joseph Smith, you judge him by the testimonies of his bitter and relentless enemies. Is this justice? "Shame, where is thy blush?" You say we are guilty of idolatry towards Joseph Smith. In this you bear false witness against your neighbour. We adore the Lord Jesus as the Son of God, and we honour Peter, Paul, and Joseph Smith as his servants. You say you "prefer Mahomet to Joseph Smith." Mahomet rejected the Divinity and atonement of Jesus Christ; but Joseph Smith believed in, gloried in, and fervently preached those transcendent principles. I am willing to suppose you did not know this; but how unpardonable is such ignorance in public

writers. You place Joseph Smith in the category of "Naylor, Munzer, Southcote, Thom," &c. These persons taught contrary to the Bible, and therefore were impostors. I defy you to prove that Joseph Smith taught contrary to the Gospel of Jesus. If he had done so, we would reject him, though his character were as pure as that of "an angel from heaven."

You say you "wonder that, in the braying of the jackass in the adjoining stable, we did not recognise the ridicule we deserved." We assure you that we are not to be driven from our principles by the ridiculous braying of jackasses, whether quadruped or biped. Our enemies find it easier to "bray" at us than to prove us scripturally wrong.

You say you "rely upon the preaching of the Gospel in its purity to annihilate Mormonism." What do you mean by "the Gospel in its purity?" Is it Calvinism, which says Christ died for a few; or Methodism, which says this is a lie—that Jesus died for all? A thousand different sects preach different doctrines, which they each call "the Gospel in its purity!" In your churches and chapels, the rich worship in the costly cushioned pew, while the "ignorant-looking men" and the "poor, common-looking drudges" of women shiver in the cold corner, to obtain tickets for blankets, soup, &c. Is this the Gospel of him who said, "Love your neighbour as yourself?"—a gospel which would make all men one with each other by making all one with God and with His Son Jesus Christ. Where is this Gospel exhibited? Alas, where?

A friend said to me, recently, "There are no sects in heaven. They are all one there." Said I, "As they are not all one here, they must undergo a great change in going there." "Ah," replied my friend, "So they must." But, said I, "The fact that they all needed a change proves them all wrong here; for if they were right, they would need no change!" My friend seemed startled at the idea of a right religion leaving its votaries wrong, and needing a change!

You seemed pleased that the old argument of faggot, axe, and gibbet is about to be resorted to in the form of "steel, lead, and American soldiers," to put down Mormonism. Why not send missionaries to prove us wrong from the Bible? Are steel, lead, and soldiers the arguments by which, as you say, "Right shall conquer might, and truth grow strong?" My principles do not need ridicule; but I cannot help remarking that Jesus said, "The servant shall be as his master." Did the Lord or his former-day ministers preach jarring doctrines, or receive hundreds and thousands of pounds per year for preaching? In the New Testament, do we read of the *Reverend* Paul, the *Right Reverend* James, the *Most Reverend* Peter, or *Lord Bishop* Andrew, living in pompous palaces, encircled by wealth and grandeur? Is this "Having food and raiment, therewith be content," as Paul taught Timothy? Is this being like him "who had not where to lay his head?" If I were to offer you a sovereign as little like a sterling coin as these servants are like the Lord, you would hand me to a policeman to share the fate of a forger and a knave. You reject the counterfeit sovereign, and I reject the counterfeit "servants" and their sham religions.

From your enlightened intellect and masterly pen, I promise myself the pleasure of reading such a reply to this letter, as will demonstrate my error, if in error I am, and thus save me and many others from the woes that error inevitably entails.

Your obedient servant,

JOHN HYDE.

CANADA.

(From a Prize Essay, by J. S. Hogan.)

In England, or France, or any of the States of Europe, if upwards of a million of the working classes had, within a short space of time, and by means hitherto unknown or unthought of, raised themselves to comparative affluence and independence, their example would be alike a matter of wonder and of instruction. To the poor, who are struggling against becoming poorer; to those who, though

they may be able to steer clear of actual want themselves, have the painful picture constantly presented to their minds of their offspring being otherwise circumstanced; to the mere "hewers of wood and drawers of water," who are too low to dream even of comforts or respectability, how deeply interesting should be the knowledge, not only that a million-and-a-half of people like themselves had been able to cast their poverty behind them, but that many millions more could "go and do likewise." Nor to the statesman, who gathers from such examples the knowledge how to make nations great, and to become great himself; or to those who are engaged in the human task of endeavouring to mitigate the evils of redundant population, should such a fact be less interesting or valuable. And this, without exaggeration, is the lesson that may be learned from the industrial history of Canada, but especially of the Upper Province.

In 1829, the population of Western Canada—for that Province, having exhibited greater progress in population and wealth, I shall at present allude to—had but one hundred and ninety-six thousand inhabitants. Its assessible property, being the real and personal estate of its people, was estimated, and I think with sufficient liberality, at £2,500,000. Its population in 1854 had increased to 1,237,600; and its assessed and assessable property not including its public lands, the timber on them, or its minerals, is set down, in round numbers, at fifty million pounds. This sum is over the assessors' returns, but when it is considered that the assessments were based upon the people's estimates of their own property, and that these are proverbially made with a view to avoiding taxation rather than to appearing rich, and that bonds and mortgages and other valuable effects were not included in the assessments, the addition of fifteen per cent.—being that made—is by no means an error on the the side of exaggeration. The Marshals appointed to correct similar returns in the United States made a much larger addition, although the property I have named, as exempted in Canada, is all assessed in the States.

Thus, then, the remaining inhabitants of 1829, and the descendants of those who have died, together with the settlers who have come into the Province since, divided between them fifty million pounds' worth of property, being £200 4s. 2d. to each family of five, and £40 0s. 2d. to each man, woman, and child,—a degree of prosperity it would be difficult to credit, were it not established by proofs wholly incontrovertible.

And who and what are the people who divide among them this magnificent property? And how have they acquired it? Did they come in as conquerors, and appropriate to themselves the wealth of others? They came in but to subdue a wilderness, and have reversed the laws of conquest; for plenty, good neighbourhood, and civilization mark their footsteps. Or did capitalists accompany them to reproduce their wealth by applying it to the enterprises and improvements of a new country? No; for capitalists wait till their pioneer, industry, first makes his report, and it is but now that they are studying the interesting one from Canada. Or did the generosity of European princes or European wealth or benevolence provide them with such outfits as secured their success? On the contrary, the wrongs of princes and the poverty of nations have been the chief causes of the settlement of America. Her prosperity is the offspring of European hopelessness. Her high position in the world is the result of the sublime efforts of despair. And he who would learn who they are who divide among them the splendid property created in Canada, has but to go to the quays of Liverpool, of Dublin, of Glasgow, and of Hamburg, and see emigrants there embarking, who knew neither progress nor hopes where they were born, to satisfy himself to the fullest.

It is the object of this essay to describe the country, its soil, its climate, and its resources, in which these people have prospered; to trace their advancement and its causes; to describe the public works and improvements they possess; to show how they govern themselves, and what are their institutions — religious, educational, and municipal; to exhibit, in short, what may guide industry in search of a place wherein to better its condition, and capital in quest of fields for profitable investment.

GEOGRAPHICAL.—Canada extends, in length, from the coast of Labrador to the river Kiministiquia, at the western extremity of Lake Superior, about sixteen hundred miles, with an average breadth of

about two hundred and thirty miles, being nearly three times as large as Great Britain and Ireland. It contains an area of about three hundred and fifty thousand square miles, or two hundred and forty millions of English acres.

Upper, or Western Canada, is comprised within the parallels of 40° to 49° N., and the meridians of 74° to 117° W. of Greenwich, and embraces an area of about one hundred thousand square miles, or sixty-four millions of acres. Of these there were, up to the 1st of January, 1854, twenty-one millions, forty-nine thousand, one hundred and sixty-four acres surveyed, consisting of thirty-one thousand, one hundred and seventy-five acres of mining tracts on the shores of Lakes Huron and Superior, four hundred and fifty-three thousand five hundred and fifty-eight acres of Indian reserves in the same localities, and twenty millions, two hundred and forty three thousand, four hundred and forty-one acres in farm, park lots, and sites for towns and villages.

As compared with the Lower Province, Upper Canada is in general a level champaign country, with gently undulating hills and rich valleys. At a distance of from fifty to one hundred miles north of Lake Ontario there is a ridge of high rocky country running towards the Ottawa or Grand River, behind which there is a wide and rich valley of great extent, bounded on the north by a mountainous country of still higher elevation. From the division line on Lake St. Francis to Sandwich, along the shores of the St. Lawrence and Lakes Ontario and Erie, there is not an elevation of any consequence; and throughout this extent the soil is generally remarkable rich.

VARIETIES.

A WOMAN, aged 70, who appeared some time ago at the Police Office, Bow Street, London, stated that she was the mother of forty children; and that her daughters had had twins three or four times.

A LETTER from Jerusalem of the 29th of November states that great agitation prevails in that city and the neighbourhood. A conflict had taken place between the inhabitants of Bethlelem and those of Tamar, in which one man was killed and several wounded. Caravans of pilgrims were beginning to arrive in the country. Jerusalem is crowded with pilgrims in a new character. A great part of the crew of the American frigate Congress had arrived there to visit the holy places, together with a great number of the crews of the three Russian ships of war now anchored at Jaffa.

"TABLE.—A broad piece of stone, brass, or the like, Hab. ii. 2; Luke i. 63. Such the the ancients used, to write upon, as they had no paper; and they wished what they wrote to continue recorded to many generations. Twice God wrote his law on tables of stone. The Romans wrote their ancient laws on twelve tables of brass. In allusion hereto, man's heart is represented as *a writing table*, and *a fleshy table*, ready to receive and be affected with divine truths. (Prov. iii. 3; vii. 3; 2 Cor. iii. 3)"—*From Gurney's Dictionary of the Bible.*

INJURIES.—"When we have received an injury which is too serious to be passed over unnoticed, and requires explanation in order to our future pleasant intercourse with the individual who inflicts it, we should neither brood over it in silence nor communicate it to a third person, but go directly to the offender himself, and state to him in private our views of his conduct. Many persons look up the injury in their own bosom, and instead of going to their offending brother, dwell upon his conduct in silence until their imagination has added to it every possible aggravation, and their mind has come to the conclusion to separate themselves for ever from his society. From that hour they neither speak to him nor think well of him, but consider and treat him as an alien from their hearts. Others, when they have received offence, set off to some friend—perhaps to more than one, to lodge their complaint, and tell how they have been treated. The report of the injury spreads farther and wider, exaggerated and swelled by those circumstances which every gossip through whose hands it passes chooses to add to the original account, until, in process of time, it comes round to the offender himself in its magnified and distorted form—who now finds that *he* in *his* turn, is aggrieved and calumniated; and thus a difficult and complicated case of offence grows out of what was, at first, very simple in its nature, and capable of being adjusted."—*James.*